

REMARKS

By this Amendment, claims 1, 5, 8, 14, 20 and 21 are amended to merely clarify the recited subject matter and claims 11, 14 and 17 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1-5, 7-10, 13-16 and 19-22 are pending.

Claims 1-5, 7-11, 13-17 and 19-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bridges et al. (U.S. 6,148,197; hereafter "Bridges"). The cancellation of claims 11, 14 and 17 renders their rejection moot. Applicant traverses the rejection of the remaining claims because Bridges fails to disclose, teach or suggest all the features recited in the rejected claims.

For example, the cited prior art fails to teach or suggest the claimed method (independent claim 1) and terminals (independent claims 8 and 14) wherein network names of wireless local area networks are stored in association with associated stored information sets, scanning for information related to names of available wireless local area networks using the terminal results in the sending of network identity requests and searches for network identity responses, and available information sets are determined by comparing the stored network names to the scanned information related to the names of available wireless local area networks.

The Office action has now asserted that wireless local networks are inherently disclosed by Bridges because there are regional carriers in the continental cellular system. Thus, the Office Action has considered the term "wireless" very broadly as referring to any local network instead of the specific techniques commonly considered as WLANs, e.g., IEEE802.11 based systems. As a result, the Office Action has failed to respond to Applicant's arguments related to technical differences between PLMN types of systems as in Bridges and WLAN systems.

As explained previously, cellular systems and WLANs have their own very different protocols for operating and are thus technically different. For instance, in a WLAN, there is no specified Mobile Switching Center (MSC) and Home Location Register (HLR) as depicted in Figure 4 of Bridge.

As explained in Applicant's specification, the present invention provides a solution existing specifically in WLANs, i.e., WLAN networks need to be scanned to determine their availability. Thus the claimed information sets are collections of information for accessing a WLAN, for instance information in Figure 2, not just network identities.

To the contrary, Bridges merely teaches a methodology for selecting a preferred wireless carrier when roaming outside of a home market by providing, in part, a mobile station with a list of preferred wireless carrier identities. Bridges, at col. 3, lines 35-49, merely teaches that a user can select, when roaming, which band or system his PCS cellular mobile station will use. Moreover, col. 5, lines 19-27 merely teaches that a list is generated for a mobile station that indicates the preferred carriers in a certain market and for a certain class of service defined for the mobile station. Finally, the passage at col. 5, line 50 to col. 6, line 3 merely explains how such a list of preferred wireless carriers is generated.

Thus, Bridges's disclosure is limited to providing a list for the mobile station (col. 6, lines 36-46), from which the mobile station selects a preferred carrier from a set of carriers in a list, which is actually provided to the mobile station by the generator from the network (col. 5 line 60-63). Bridges's selector operates to select the preferred wireless carrier identity not to determine (on the basis of any comparison) available information sets describing setting used to access wireless local area networks and their associated resources.

Thus, Bridges fails to teach or suggest storing network names of wireless local area networks in association with associated stored information sets. Further, those passages clearly fail to teach or suggest any scanning for information related to names of available wireless local area networks using the terminal which results in the sending of network identity requests and searches for network identity responses. Moreover, Bridges clearly does not determine available information sets by comparing the stored network names to the scanned information related to the names of available wireless local area networks.


Accordingly, Applicant submits that the claimed invention is patentable over the teachings of Bridges and requests the issuance of a Notice to that effect. However, if anything is necessary to place the application in condition for allowance, Applicant requests that the Examiner telephone the undersigned Applicant representative.

*BALOGH -- 09/785,518
Attorney Docket: 060258-0277121

Please charge any fees associated with the submission of this paper to Deposit Account Number 033975. The Commissioner for Patents is also authorized to credit any over payments to the above-referenced Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP



CHRISTINE H. MCCARTHY
Reg. No. 41844
Tel. No. 703.770.7743
Fax No. 703 905.2500

Date: September 25, 2006
P.O. Box 10500
McLean, VA 22102
(703) 770-7900